DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 178 473 SP 014 370

AUTHOR Yarger, Gwen P.; Brannigan, Marilyn B.
TITLE A Survey of Teachers' Perceptions of University Courses.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 35p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Course Content; Evaluation Criteria; *Inservice Teacher Education; Needs Assessment; *Program Evaluation; *Program Improvement; Promotion (Occupational); Teacher Characteristics

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate inservice teachers' perceptions about a variety of university course characteristics and to solicit their opinions about future courses. A survey form designed to obtain demographic information, personal reasons for course selection, and evaluation of inservice opportunities at the state university was sent to 341 public school educators. Results of this survey are presented in tabular form with narrative explanation of the reasons the questions were asked. The implications for program development drawn from this study are discussed with suggestions for future changes in the university program. (JD)

A Survey of Teachers' Perceptions of University Courses

Gwen P. Yarger
Marilyn B. Brannigan
School of Education
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13210

GWEN P. YARGER
MARILYN B. BRANNIGAN

PURPOSE

The purpose of this study was to investigate inservice teacher's perceptions about a variety of university course characteristics, and to solicit their opinions about future courses. Interest in this area has risen in response to reduced teacher turnover rate which, in turn, has lead to a teaching force that has become both highly "degreed" and credentialed. RESPONSIVENESS to both teacher and district interest has become a key element in program development. Inservice teacher educators are currently devoting a great deal of time to discussions that include such topics as WHO should teach inservice teachers, WHAT should be the content and format, WHERE and WHEN should the offerings occur. Specifically, this study is reporting on the responses of 341 educators from 13 districts to a 90 item questionnaire.

PERSPECTIVE

Over the years inservice education has been described, defined and conceptualized in many ways. Typical of these definitions and probably as good as any, was that presented by C. Glenn Hass in the National Society for the Study of Education's 1957 yearbook:

> ...inservice education includes all activities engaged in by the professional personnel during their service and designed to contribute to improvement on the job.

Although this definition seems quite broad at first glance it actually possesses some important constraints. To be considered "inservice education," an activity must serve practicing professionals, and it must be designed to help that professional improve his/her ability to perform professional tasks. This definition served as the base for constructing the questionnaire used in this study.

The definitional constraints not withstanding, professional educators enroll in inservice activities for a variety of reasons. Sometimes the goal is to secure promotion and/or salary increments. Another reason for engaging in an inservice activity is that professionals in practice generally want assistance

for immediate concerns that can quickly be put into practice. Finally, and perhaps most important, Julius (1976) found the greatest incentive to be the desire for professional improvement.

In light of these varied needs to be met, inservice, of necessity, must be multidimensional in delivery format. In 1966, a list of nineteen different types of inservice programs were identified, ranging from the traditional course through the more flexible institute and conference to the exotic cultural experience. Since 1966 these notions have been reworked and modified by many. More recently, five general contexts for inservice education have been identified (Joyce, Howey, Yarger, 1976):

- the job-embedded -- refers to that which professionals learn by interacting with others on the job (committees, team teaching, contact with consultants).
- the job-related -- refers to training related to, but not part of, the job (workshops, teacher exchanges, teacher centers).
- the credential-oriented -- refers to the professional as a student of higher education (college credit/noncredit courses).
- the professional organization-related -- refers to the various organization-sponsored activities in which professionals participate (conferences, professional reading material).
- the self-directed -- refers to those professional activities for which the motivation is internal but enabling factors are external (released time activities, sabbatical leave).

The important point is that inservice education can occur in a variety of ways and possess a variety of purposes. The question of whether or not a university-sponsored program can address few, some, many or all of these inservice contexts has yet to be answered, and was clearly a factor for conducting this study.

Some preferences of teachers and other educators concerning inservice education have already emerged. For example, it has been found that needs assessment which includes participant input is important for the establishment of inservice program credibility, as practicing educators do not want a third party determining their needs (Lytle, 1977). Timing is also a crucial factor, with inservice during working hours cited as the educator's preferrence. Julius (1976) found that the distance one must travel to attend an activity is an important factor. In another survey, more than 1,200 South Dakota teachers' attitudes toward inservice education revealed that the most useful structures were two-week "Current Trends in Education" courses, in-classroom assistance from another teacher, workshops on college campuses, and special college courses conducted at the local school by a college or university staff member (Betz, Jensen, Zigarmi, 1978).

It is with knowledge of this variety of delivery options and multi-faceted preferences of professional educators that this study was undertaken. The particular focus of this investigation was inservice education provided by a private institution of higher education and placed in off-campus settings.

SUBJECTS

The population consisted of faculties whose schools were located within a 50 mile radius of Syracuse University. The sample consisted of 341 public school educators who were located in school buildings selected randomly from school districts found within the target area. Of this sample, 114 (33.4%) were elementary teachers and 147 (43.1%) were secondary teachers. The remainder (23.5%) listed themselves as couselor, special education teacher, special subject teacher, or administrator. One hundred (29.3%) of the subjects indicated they had never taken a Syracuse University course.

QUESTIONNAIRE

The survey form was designed in two parts. The first part consisted of fifteen demographic items; the second part contained seventy substantive items which were concerned with reasons for course selection and evaluation. All items were multiple choice items, some asking for a single response while others asked for multiple, prioritized responses. The responses were collected on an Op-scan form which allowed for machine scoring, and facilitated data analysis.

In developing the survey form, colleagues and students were asked to respond to the format, clarity of questions and length of the survey. The instrument was field tested in two Syracuse University graduate classes attended by students similar in professional position to those who would become subjects. An item analysis was conducted. Based on the results, ambiguities were clarified and test items were reworded and/or deleted. Finally, validity and reliability data were gathered.

DELIVERY AND RETRIEVAL

Six-hundred fifty surveys were sent to thirteen public school districts. Equal distribution to elementary and secondary schools was achieved by controlling for faculty size in the selected schools. Superintendents of thirteen districts were contacted first by letter which explained the purpose of the survey as one

means of assessing professional development needs and teacher interests. The superintendents, in all but one district, permitted the principals to be contacted for permission to distribute the survey. Another district was selected to replace the one negative response. The principals were contacted by telephone; a letter detailing the purpose and procedures followed within 5 days. Each set of questionnaires was personally delivered to either the school principal or the secretary and collected in the same manner.

To increase the return rate, a free inservice workshop was offered to the school with the highest percentage of return. Only one school returned 100% of the forms. In addition, each teacher who completed a survey had the opportunity to win a free three-credit course at Syracuse University. Although response was received from all 13 districts, the percentage of return varied from 10% to 100%. These procedures resulted in a total return rate of 52% of the sample.

DATA ANALYSIS

Subsequent to the machine scoring process, tables were constructed that presented the data in the form of frequency distributions and percentages. In this form, the data were examined for patterns, trends, and apparent or possible differences. Finally, the investigators posed as many "questions of logic" as could be developed, e.g., 'Will older teachers prefer standard courses?" These processes led to the development of a series of questions that could be addressed by the construction of cross tabulations and tested for significance (X^2).

A culling process was then utilized to distill the list of questions to not only those that could be examined, but also to those that were important. Obvious questions, e.g., "Have older teachers taken more courses?" and ludicrous questions, e.g.,"Do females over 30 prefer to drive long distances for courses?" were deleted. The remaining questions were tested. The results can be found in the next section of this paper.

Further analysis may reveal even more. There is little in the data or the literature, however, to suggest that this is the case. Although as others examine the data more usable information may emerge; time and financial considerations suggested a point of diminishing returns at this point.

REPORTING THE DATA

Characteristics and Position *

Questions under the heading Characteristics and Position provided information related to such things as respondents marital standing, age and degree. For brevity and purpose of description the mode of each characteristic was calculated to provide a picture of the "typical" respondent. This "typical" respondent:

1. was a married female
2. was between the ages of 35-36
3. held no degree from Syracuse University
4. was not currently enrolled or matriculated at Syracuse University
5. was not currently matriculated in any degree program
6. held a Master's degree with Permanent Certification at the Secondary level
7. was teaching in a school of nearly 1,000 students.

Items 4 and 5 above are of special note. When asked whether or not each was currently enrolled in a program at Syracuse University, the respondents indicated that only 38 (11.1%) were so involved. When asked if they were working on a degree somewhere other than at Syracuse University, 32 (9.4%) indicated that they were. By adding these data, one can see that only 20.5% of the individuals were currently involved with university courses in pursuit of a degree.

Supporting the popular claims of a well credentialed teaching force, it was noted that of the 341 individuals responding to the questionnaire, 269 (78.9%) hold Permanent Certification. Additionally, 291 (85.3%) were employed fulltime with 316 (92.7%) employed by public school systems.

Course Selection

Ten categories were identified as possible reasons why individuals might have enrolled in a course at Syracuse University. Individuals were asked to rank the ten categories as (1) very important reason
(2) considered but less important reason
(3) relatively unimportant

---

* For the sake of brevity, the complete demographic data tables from which this synthesis was constructed have been omitted. They may be obtained from the authors at the School of Education, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY 13210.

These data are presented in Table 1. It should be noted that this item permitted a legitimate non-response to individual categories. Because the number of responses varied, Table 1 shows the frequency, percentage and total for each category. The categories most frequently selected as very important were Convenience of Extended Campus Location (55.0%), Location of University (51.0%), and Other (53.0%) (e.g. received financial grant, district paid tuition for approved course, availability of Masters program in area of interest, availability of courses in specific areas, right course at right time, and content of course study).

The items indicated as relatively unimportant included Individualization of Degree Program and Availability of Counseling. Categories which played a role in selecting Syracuse University graduate courses at a considered but less important level were Quality of Faculty (50.0%) and Academic Status of Syracuse University (48.0%).

Looking at reasons why an individual enrolled in extended campus rather than on-campus courses provided the data in Table 2. It would appear that Fulfilling Certification Requirements (42.2%) and Improving Teaching Skills (37.5%) were the most important reasons, while Requirements by a School System and Meeting Other Teachers were the least frequently selected items. Items written into the Other category included comments such as: no parking problems, the convenience, self-discipline of academic study and the university most convenient for obtaining advanced degree required for job.

Preferred Class Structure

Table 3 provides data about the preferences of individuals for either on-campus or extended campus locations for different types of class structures. Of interest is the number of individuals with no preference. However, while the data appear to indicate that extended campus courses are preferred no matter what structure is used, Workshops tend to be more popular for extended campus courses.

Table 1

Frequencies and Percentages of Reasons for Course Enrollment at Syracuse University

Category	Very Important		Considered		Unimportant		Total
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	N
Location of University	119	.51	91	.39	25	.11	235
Convenience of Extended Campus Location	122	.55	53	.24	47	.21	222
Academic status of S.U.	62	.26	115	.48	64	.27	241
Quality of faculty	62	.26	117	.50	55	.24	234
Variety of degree progress	61	.26	84	.36	87	.38	232
Variety of courses offered	95	.43	83	.38	42	.19	220
Individualization of degree requirements	59	.27	64	.30	93	.43	216
Availability of Counseling	29	.13	75	.31	126	.55	230
Reputation of program department	76	.31	79	.34	74	.33	229
Remitted tuition	91	.40	54	.24	83	.36	228
Other	39	.53	4	.05	31	.42	74

Table 2

Frequencies and Percentages of Reasons for Course Enrollment at Syracuse University

Category	Most Important		Second Improtant		Third Important		Not Selected	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Improve teaching skill	128	37.5	62	18.2	35	10.3	116	34.0
Fulfill certification	144	42.2	28	8.2	43	12.6	126	37.0
Requirement of school system	51	15.0	37	10.9	60	17.6	193	56.3
Degree program	60	17.6	38	11.1	65	19.1	178	52.2
Salary Increase	53	15.5	63	18.5	70	20.5	155	45.5
Personal Satisfaction	61	17.9	45	13.2	63	18.5	172	50.4
Meet other Teachers	10	2.9	22	6.5	84	24.6	225	66.0
Other	11	3.2	3	.9	14	4.1	313	91.8

Table 3

Frequencies and Percentages Between On-Campus and Extended Courses

Category (N 341)	On Campus		Extended Campus		No Preference	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Seminar	44	12.9	147	43.1	150	44.0
Lecture	62	18.2	108	31.7	171	50.1
Workshop	49	14.4	180	52.8	112	32.8
Lecture-discussion	43	12.6	142	41.6	156	45.8
TV	40	11.7	122	35.9	179	52.4
Other	7	2.1	9	2.6	325	95.3

Evaluation

Respondents were asked to indicate how they evaluated a course by stating whether they placed a great deal of emphasis, some emphasis, or little emphasis on a variety of course characteristics (See Table 4.) The three areas given a great deal of emphasis when evaluating a course were Instructor's Preparation (89.7%) , Content (82.5%) and Appropriateness of Assignments (86.7%). The areas of little concern were Testing (33.4%) and Number of Written Assignments (32.5%). Other category reasons included: relevance of course to job, personality and attitude of the instructor, relationship of personal objectives to course objectives, instructors experience and expertise (not to be confused with credentials), and amount of interaction among participants.

Course Location

In trying to determine reasons for the selection of a course location, respondents were asked to share their preferences. Examination of Table 5 reveals that important reasons for taking extended campus courses were: Convenience (88.2%) and Reduced Cost (88.0%). Having little or no bearing on the decision was the Perception the extended campus courses were less demanding (61.4%). The Other (48.0%) category included such considerations as nearness to home, safety (the key issue for night classes), more relaxed atmosphere and the availability of course information.

Motivational Techniques

Data were gathered to assist in the development of motivational techniques related to designing courses in the future. Table 6 displays data which indicates whether or not individuals would be Greatly Influenced, Mildly Influenced or Not Influenced by a list of motivational factors. These data indicated that individuals would be greatly influenced to enroll in an extended campus course if the course were Tailored to the Needs of the School (66.7%) and if they received a Salary Increase (64.6%). Those items that would have no influence were the Availability of an Advisor (45.1%) and Counseling (47.9%). Only 59 people made additional suggestions in the Other category. These suggestions included: continuation of previous course and the need for salary increase to offset the cost of tuition.

Table 4

Frequencies and Percentages of Course Evaluation Criteria

Category N=341	Great Deal		Some		Little		No Reply
	Frequency	Percentage *	Frequency	Percentage *	Frequency	Percentage *	
Instructor's preparation	297	89.7	30	9.1	4	1.2	10
Instructor's delivery	233	70.2	94	28.3	5	1.5	9
Feedback to students	192	58.0	115	34.7	23	6.9	11
Content	273	82.5	52	15.7	6	1.8	10
Number of written assignments	70	21.1	154	46.4	108	32.5	9
Quantity of reading	88	26.5	169	50.9	75	22.6	9
Appropriateness of assignments	288	86.7	40	12.0	4	1.2	9
Course objectives accomplished	224	67.7	93	28.1	14	4.2	10
Testing	71	21.4	150	45.2	111	33.4	9
Grading system	103	31.2	144	43.6	83	25.2	11
Other	13	3.8	8	2.3	21	6.2	299

* Percentages have been adjusted to reflect the number of responses

Table 5

Category N= 341	Highly Significant *		Some *		No Bearing *		No Reply
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	
Parking	197	59.3	102	30.7	33	9.9	9
Reduced cost of Extended Campus	293	88.0	30	9.0	10	3.0	8
Convenience	292	88.2	33	10.0	6	1.8	10
Professor's reputation	165	49.4	143	42.8	26	7.8	7
Perception that Extended Campus less demanding	34	10.2	93	28.0	204	61.4	9
Personal Safety	95	28.6	81	24.4	156	47.0	9
Advertising	76	23.3	149	45.7	101	31.0	15
Other	16	32.0	10	20.0	24	48.0	291

* Percentages have been adjusted due to missing responses

Table 6

Category N=341	Greatly Influence Frequency	Greatly Influence * Percentage	Mildly Frequency	Mildly * Percentage	No Influence Frequency	No Influence * Percentage	No Reply
Course tailored to school needs	226	66.7	93	27.4	20	5.9	2
Course designed cooperatively	173	50.9	120	35.3	47	13.8	1
Credit toward certification	146	43.3	50	14.8	141	41.8	4
Advanced degree	168	49.4	88	25.9	84	24.7	1
Salary increase	219	64.6	103	30.4	17	5.0	2
Personal need	184	54.3	128	37.8	27	8.0	2
Availability of advisor	59	17.5	126	37.4	152	45.1	4
Counseling	49	14.5	127	37.6	162	47.9	3
Informal/non-credit seminars	107	31.8	118	35.1	110	32.7	6
Other	19	38.8	10	20.4	20	40.8	292

* Percentages adjusted due to missing responses

Criteria for Extended Campus Course Selection

Individuals were asked how important certain criteria were in deciding whether or not to take an extended campus course rather than an on-campus couarse. Table 7 presents these data. The most important criteria were Reputation of Course 63.3%), Distance From Home (64.2%) and Reputation of the Professor (57.4%). Adveristing appears to be of mild concern (46.4%) Listed repeatedly in the Other category was the concern of cost. (A note of interest is that the tuition on extended campus is $40.00 per course less than that on-campus). Another criterion used was the time framework, with the expectation that extended campus courses tend to have greater variety (e.g. 6 Saturdays vs 15 weekly sessions).

Usefulness of the Course and Available Parking were also listed repeatedly in the Other category.

Course Purpose

Individuals were asked to indicate how much emphasis should be placed on courses dealing primarily with Content (e.g. Secondary Science), Process (e.g. Managing Learning Centers), or Product (Evaluation of Students). Data in Table 8 shows that individuals would prefer courses that emphasized Content rather than Process or Product.

When asked whether or not individuals would register in extended campus courses where the professor visited the classroom, the response was:

Yes	136	(39.9%)
No	84	(24.6%)

One hundred twenty one individuals (35.5%) elected not to respond either Yes or No.

Preferred Days, Time, Season

In trying to determine preferred days, time and seasons, several questions were asked. Table 9 provides information about preferred days of the week.

The data indicate that Monday or Tuesday (32.6% each) were the first choice while Wednesday (30.2%) was a close second.
Table 10 provides the information related to time preference for attending classes. The greatest number of respondents preferred classes held between 4:00 and 6:10 PM.

Table 7

Frequencies and Percentages of Criteria Used to Determine Enrollment in Extended Campus Courses

Category N= 341	Highly Important		Mildly Important		Unimportant		No Reply
	Frequency	Percentage *	Frequency	Percentage *	Frequency	Percentage *	
Reputation of Course	214	63.3	99	29.3	25	7.4	3
Reputation of Professor	194	57.4	117	34.6	27	8.0	3
Distance from home	217	64.2	103	30.5	18	5.3	3
Advertising	126	37.7	155	46.4	53	15.9	7
Other	16	43.2	3	8.1	18	48.6	304

* Percentage adjusted due to missing responses

Table 8

Frequencies and Percentages of Preferences for Content, Process or Product Courses

Category N = 341	Great Deal of Interest		Some Interest		No Interest	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Content courses	183	53.7	106	31.1	52	15.3
Process courses	151	44.3	151	44.3	39	11.5
Product courses	122	35.8	152	44.6	67	19.7

Table 9

Frequencies and Percentages of Preferred Days for Courses

Category N=341	First Choice		Second Choice	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Sunday	8	2.3	11	3.2
Monday	111	32.6	53	15.5
Tuesday	111	32.6	71	20.8
Wednesday	56	16.4	103	30.2
Thursday	33	9.7	74	21.7
Friday	2	.6	4	1.2
Saturday	10	2.9	14	4.1
No preference	10	2.9	11	3.2

Table 10

Frequency and Percentage of Preferred Times for COurse

Time	Code	Frequency	Percentage
4:00 - 6:10 pm	1	183	53.7
4:30 - 6:40 pm	2	60	17.6
7:00 - 9:10 pm	3	67	19.6
Saturday Morning 9:00 - 12:00 am	4	10	2.9
Saturday all day 9:00 am - 4:00 pm	5	3	.9
Saturday afternoon 1:00 - 4:00 pm	6	2	.6
No preference	7	15	4.5
Other	8	1	.3
Total		341	100.00
Median	1.4		
Mode	1.0		

Next individuals were asked which semester they preferred to take courses and whether they preferred an on-campus or extended campus location. Table 11 shows that individuals preferred to take courses during the Spring at extended campus locations. Summer was the least preferred semester, with no location preference.

Table 12 provides information about the preferred time structure. As shown, 189 (55.4%) individuals preferred the traditional time structure of 2 hours per week for 15 weeks. The least preferred structure was a two week intensive course.

School District Contribution

When asked whether or not the school district contributed to the cost of tuition, 108 (31.7%) replied YES while 211 (61.9%) replied NO and 22 (6.5%) did not respond. Those who responded YES were asked to indicate what percentage of the tuition costs the district paid. The replies indicated that 102 (77.3%) received 76-100% support from the district, 10 (2.9%) received 51-75% support, 10 (2.9%) received 26-50% support, and 10 (2.9%) received less than 25% support.

Analysis by Age

Teachers seem to be remaining in education longer, seem to have multiple degrees and are often certified in more than one area. These tendencies led the researchers to cross tabulate age, highest degree held, and current area of certification with variables relating to course enrollment.

Age and reasons for taking courses were examined. The results as shown on Table 13 indicate that educators between the ages of 46 and 65 selected Improving Teaching Skills as the most important reason for taking courses . (X^2 27.41, df 10, $\leq$ .01)

The next consideration was that of age and types of classes best offered on either extended or on-campus (See Table 14).
Of the possible delivery formats, (Seminar, Lecture, Workshop, Lecture-Discussion. T.V.) the only significant difference occured between age and the lecture m[illegible]

Table 11

Frequency and Percentage for Course Location by Preferred Semester

Location	Code	Fall		Spring		Summer	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
On-campus	1	53	15.5	29	8.5	64	18.8
Extended Campus	2	160	46.9	167	49.0	74	21.7
No location preference	3	55	16.1	51	15.0	72	21.1
Do not like courses this semester	4	42	12.3	55	16.1	92	27.0
Not taking courses	5	31	8.8	39	11.1	39	11.4
Median		2.14		2.23		2.69	
Mode		2.00		2.00		4.00	

Table 12

Frequency and Percentage for Preferred Time Structure

Time Structure N=341	Code	Frequency	Percentages
2 hours for 15 weeks	1	189	55.4
4 hours for 8 weeks	2	66	19.4
Intensive two weeks	3	39	11.4
No preference	4	41	12.0
Other	5	6	1.8
Median	1.35		
Mode	1.00		

Table 13

Percentages Related to Age and Improvement of Teaching Skills

Ages	Most Imp.	2nd Imp.	3rd Imp.	N
20 - 25	53.3	26.7	20.0	15
26 - 35	41.6	39.0	19.5	77
36 - 45	52.5	25.4	22.0	59
46 - 55	80.4	17.4	2.2	46
56 - 65	86.7	6.7	6.7	15
65 - over	50.0	50.0	0	2

The preference for the Lecture method on-campus was exhibited by the 20-26 year age group while the 56-65 age group seemed to prefer the Lecture method on extended campus. For those between the ages of 26-45, the no preference category was favored . ($X^2$18.01, df 10, ρ.05)

The third set of variables analyzed was that of age and degree of emphasis placed on items relative to course evaluation.

One significant item was the Grading System. Table 15 reveals that compared to other age groups those between the ages of 36-45 appear to place the most emphasis on the Grading System, while the 20-25 year old group and the 46-55 group place some emphasis on Grading System as a means of evaluating courses. ($x^2$21.05, df10, ρ.01)

Next data concerning age and reasons for enrolling in future extended campus courses are presented in Table 16. Of significance were the 36-45, 46-55, and 56-65 year age groups who were more interested in Nominally Priced Seminars than were other groups. ($X^2$24.05, df 10, ρ.01)

Two other characteristics were examined within this category of age and reasons for enrolling in future extended campus courses. The 20-25 year old group selected fulfilling certification requirements ($X^2$15.70, df 10, ρ.10) and being able to meet socially with colleagues ($X^2$17.17, df 10, ρ.07) with a greater frequency than the other age groups.

Highest Degree Held

The data were examined to determine if differences existed between groups of individuals who held degrees (i.e. bachelors, masters, specialist or doctorate), their preferences related to course structure, and reasons for taking courses.

Difference in attitude between the importance each degree group placed on reasons for taking courses were examined. Results indicated certain tendencies showing that the Opportunity to Meet Other Teachers ($X^2$14.00, df 8, ρ.08) was considered among the least important reasons for taking courses. Personal Satisfaction ($X^2$14.03, df 8, ρ.08) was considered more important to the sixth year and doctorate degree groups with Personal Satisfaction being least important to the bachelor degree group.

Table 14

Percentages Related to Age and Lecture Breferred On-Campus or Extended Campus

Ages	On-Campus	Extended Campus	No Preference	N
20 - 25	42.3	23.1	34.6	26
26 - 35	19.4	30.6	50.0	124
36 - 45	16.3	30.2	53.5	86
46 - 55	15.4	44.2	40.4	52
56 - 65	18.8	56.3	25.0	16
65 - over	0.0	50.0	50.0	2

Table 15

Percentages Relative to Age and Preference for Grading System as a Means of Course Evaluation

Age	Great Emphasis	Some Emphasis	Little Emphasis	N
20 - 25	25.0	53.6	21.4	28
26 - 35	33.8	43.1	23.1	130
36 - 45	44.2	29.1	26.7	86
46 - 55	11.5	59.8	28.8	52
56 - 65	33.3	38.9	27.8	18
65 - over	1.0	100.0	0.0	1

Table 16

Percentages Related to Age and Interest in Nominally Priced Update Seminars

Age	Greatly Influence	Mildly Influence	No Influepce	N
20 - 25	7.4	40.7	51.9	27
26 - 35	24.2	38.6	37.1	132
36 - 45	42.0	31.8	26.1	88
46 - 55	38.5	36.5	25.0	52
56 - 65	42.1	21.1	36.8	19
65 - over	100.00	0.0	0.0	2

A significant difference was found between and among degree groups and the emphasis placed on the need to Fulfill Certification Requirements. Table 18 demonstrates that Certification is the Most Important to all the degree groups except for the sixth year degree group ($X^2$20.12, df 8, $\geq$ .01)

Current Area of Certification

Advisor Availability for Program Planning had been anticipated as a highly desirable influence. The data indicate that such was not the case. Looking at groups according to their Area of Certification in Table 19 9t is shown that Advisor Availability is not an inportment factor ($X^2$38.39,df 14, $\geq$ .0005).

Interestingly, as with Highest Degree Held groups, the Current Area of Certification groups also stated a significant level of No Preference concerning the best location for the Lecture format. Table 20 provides the distribution of this data ($X^2$23.97, df 14, $\geq$ .05).

TV is Best Offered

Significant findings developed criteria in terms of how individuals evaluate courses offered on television (TV). It was found that the groups placed great emphasis on the Instructor's Preparation ($X^2$9.46, df 4, $\geq$ .05), the Appropriateness of Assignments ($X^2$10.90, df 4, $\geq$ .03), and the Content Covered ($X^2$8.06, df 4 $\geq$ .09).

Table 17

Frequencies and Percentages Related to Highest Degree Held and Preference of Location for Lecture Course Structure

Degree	Offered On Campus		Offered Extended Campus		No Preference		N
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	
Bachelors	25	21.7	44	38.3	46	40.0	
Masters	34	21.9	42	27.1	79	51.0	
6 year	0	00.0	3	25.0	9	75.0	
Doctorate	0	00.0	0	00.0	2	100.0	
Other	0	00.0	8	66.7	4	33.3	

Table 18

Frequencies and Percentages Related to Highest Degree Held and Importance of Certification Requirements for Taking College Credits

Degree	Most Important		Second Important		Third Important	
	Frequency	Row Percentage	Frequency	Row Percentage	Frequency	Row Percentage
Bachelors	70	79.5	10	15.1	8	9.1
Masters	58	62.4	14	15.1	21	22.6
6th year	1	14.3	2	28.6	4	57.1
Doctorage	2	66.7	0	00.0	1	33.3
Other	4	50.0	1	12.5	3	37.5

Table 19

Frequencies and Percentages Related to Area of Certification And Influence of Advisor Availability

Area of Certification	Greatly Influence		Mildly Influence		No Influence	
	Frequency	Row Percentage	Frequency	Row Percentage	Frequency	Row Percentage
Elementary	33	34.4	28	29.2	35	36.5
Secondary	14	9.7	55	37.9	76	52.4
Special Ed	1	9.1	5	45.5	5	45.5
Child and Family	0	00.0	1	100.0	0	00.0
Counseling	0	00.0	2	33.3	4	66.7
Health - Phys Ed	1	6.7	9	60.0	5	33.3
Ed. Admin.	0	00.0	3	100.0	0	00.0
Other	7	16.3	16	37.2	20	46.5

Table 20

Frequencies and Percentages Related to Area of Certification And Preference of Location for Lecture Course Structure

Area of Certification	Offered On Campus		Offered Extended Campus		No Preference	
	Frequency	Row Percentage	Frequency	Row Percentage	Frequency	Row Percentage
Elementary	8	8.7	36	39.1	48	52.2
Secondary	35	25.2	45	32.4	59	42.4
Special Ed	4	36.4	3	27.3	4	36.4
Child and Family	0	00.0	1	100.0	0	00.0
Counseling	1	20.0	2	40.0	2	40.0
Health - Phys Ed	2	15.4	1	7.7	10	76.9
Ed Admin.	0	00.0	0	00.0	3	100.0
Other	11	27.5	13	32.5	16	40.0

In the area of evaluation, the respondents cited the following factors as important: the instructor's preparation, the content covered, and the appropriateness of assignments. It has been commonly thought that students enroll in extended campus courses because they are believed to be less demanding. Yet, responses suggest that this factor has little or no bearing on course selection. The reputation of the professor and the course, on the other hand, appear to be important factors in deciding whether or not to enroll in a course.

It had been thought that several other factors would also bear heavily on an individual's decision to take a course. These factors included: the opportunity to meet other teachers, the availability of an advisor for purposes of counseling and the various types of advertising that are used. Each of these proved to have little or no bearing on an individual's decision to enroll in a course.

It appears that a set of guidelines can be generated using the data collected from this group of 341 teachers. In planning programs, these elements should be considered:

- locating the course conveniently for the population to be served
- designing courses to meet certification requirements for the 20-25 age group
- designing courses to improve teaching skills for the 46-65 age group
- selecting instructors who will provide a sense of knowledge and preparedness, who will provide content suitable to the course description and who will design assignments appropriate to the content
- scheduling the course on Monday or Tuesdays at 4:00 during the Spring semester
- advertising through brochures which provide information about the content, location, and the professor who will be teaching the course
- disseminating information about successful and highly accepted courses
- attempting to design courses in cooperation with school districts or to meet the needs of individual buildings

Provisions which appear to be relatively unimportant in causing teachers to select a course include:

- counseling services
- opportunities to meet other teachers
- requirements imposed by individual districts (since this phenomenon is rare, this item may be misleading)

Using the information generated in this study, the investigators are attempting to incorporate the above suggestions. Both the Office of Extended Campus and the Teaching Centers are meeting with individual teachers, faculties and administrators to seek guidance and recommendations concerning the development of new courses. An increased effort is being made to locate courses within buildings where faculties have expressly asked for them. A pilot course is underway in which the professor provides assistance in the teacher's own classroom. Another pilot program being developed is a diagnostic, clinical approach to helping teachers identify the skills they wish to improve, followed by a means to practice that improvement in a classroom setting.

It is anticipated that as educators become increasingly comfortable with the notion of on-going professional learning, greater demands will be placed upon inservice program developers. It is expected that continued questioning and research by all involved will provide a strong foundation for such programming.

Betz, Loren, Darrell Jensen, and Patricia Zigarmi, "South Dakota Teachers View Inservice Education," Phi Delta Kappan, March, 1978, p. 491-494

C. Glen Hass, "In-Service Education Today," Nelson B. Henry, ed., In-Service Education for Teachers, Supervisors, and Administrators: The Fifty-sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I, p. 13. Chicago: NSSE, 1957

Joyce, Bruce R., Kenneth R. Howey, Sam J. Yarger. ISTE Report I, Issues to Face, sponsored by the National Center for Education Statistics, and Teacher Corps, 1976.

Julius, Arline, "British Teacher Centers: Practical Applications for America," Phi Delta Kappan, Nov., 1976, p. 250-253.

Lytle, James A., "Pennsylvania's Pioneering Program of Inservice Education," Phi Delta Kappan, December, 1977, p. 267-268.